JOURNAL OF CULTURAL ANALYSIS AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change,
2025, 10(4), 3899-3910
ISSN: 2589-1316

Deterrence Without Rationality: Economic Analysis of the US Sentencing Guidelines and Lessons for Post-Socialist Criminal Justice Reform

Teng Junaidi Gunawan[1*], Maria Grasia Sari Soetopo Conboy[2]

[1] *Universitas 17 Agustus 1945, Email: tengjgunawan@gmail.com*
[2] *Universitas Pelita Harapan*

***Corresponding Author:** tengjgunawan@gmail.com

Citation: Gunawan, T. J., & Conboy, M. G. S. (2025). Deterrence Without Rationality: Economic Analysis of the US Sentencing Guidelines and Lessons for Post-Socialist Criminal Justice Reform, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(4), 3899-3910. https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i4.3682

Published: December 26, 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines the deterrent effectiveness of the United States Sentencing Guidelines (USSG) §2B1.1 on economic crimes through the analytical framework of Economic Analysis of Law (EAL). It situates the discussion within the broader context of post-socialist legal reforms in Eastern Europe, where several jurisdictions such as Poland, Romania, and Ukraine are currently reassessing sentencing proportionality and deterrence in economic crime policy. The research addresses a central question: whether the USSG achieves the utilitarian objective of ensuring that punishment exceeds the expected criminal gain and maintains proportionality between economic harm and sanction.The study employs a combined normative legal and quantitative economic approach. It analyses statutory sentencing ranges, guideline formulas, and empirical data on loss values, fine levels, and imprisonment durations in major U.S. fraud and embezzlement cases. The economic valuation of punishment is modelled through cost–benefit ratios, measuring deterrence efficiency against the principles proposed by Bentham and Becker. Comparative references to Eastern European sentencing frameworks are included to identify structural similarities and differences in punishment calibration.The analysis reveals three principal deficiencies within the USSG framework: (1) statutory maximum fines often represent less than 15% of actual economic losses in high-value cases; (2) the deterrent value of imprisonment diminishes as case magnitude increases, producing relative leniency for large-scale crimes; and (3) the guidelines lack a rational formula linking financial harm to either fine magnitude or imprisonment duration. These deficiencies, compounded by the prevalence of plea bargaining, undermine deterrence and consistency in sentencing. For transitional legal systems in Eastern Europe, these findings caution against the uncritical import of Western sentencing models. The study proposes evidence-based reforms, including income-adjusted day-fine mechanisms and economically calibrated sanction formulas, to restore proportionality and deterrent credibility. It demonstrates EAL's methodological potential for operationalising normative criminal justice theories into measurable and rational sentencing frameworks.

Keywords: Economic Analysis of Law; Sentencing Reform; Deterrence; Eastern Europe; Proportionality; Economic Crime.

INTRODUCTION

The reform of criminal justice systems in Eastern European countries following the collapse of socialist regimes represents one of the most significant legal transformations of recent decades. Countries such as Poland, which adopted a new Criminal Code in 1997; Romania, which has undergone continuous anti-corruption reforms since EU accession in 2007; and Ukraine, which initiated comprehensive criminal justice modernization following the 2014 Revolution of Dignity, exemplify the complex challenges of post-socialist legal transition. As these countries move toward European Union accession or approximation, they face a dual imperative: to dismantle and revise Soviet-era criminal codes while simultaneously integrating Western legal principles and EU standards in criminal law. This complex transitional process requires a careful balance between managing the burdens of post-socialist legal legacies and adopting modern international norms, creating a unique context that demands rigorous, evidence-based assessment of potential sentencing models.

The United States Sentencing Guidelines (USSG), which became effective on November 1, 1987, following the establishment of the U.S. Sentencing Commission (USSC) in 1984, marked a major shift in Western criminal justice policy (United States Sentencing Commission, 1984; United States Sentencing Commission Guidelines Manual 2024, 2024). The USSG was designed to replace indeterminate sentencing with a determinate framework grounded in structured guidelines aimed at achieving proportionality, reducing disparity, and ensuring fairness in federal sentencing outcomes. Drawing on Jack Kress's interpretation of Sue Titus Reid's "just deserts" theory, the USSG embraces the notion that criminal sanctions must be proportional to the harm caused by the offense. As a widely studied and internationally influential model, the USSG has served as a benchmark for jurisdictions exploring structured sentencing reform. However, recent data cast doubt on the system's deterrent efficacy, particularly in addressing economic crimes. In 2022, property crime rates in the United States increased for the first time since 2001, with larceny-theft rising by 7.4%. These figures suggest potential structural weaknesses in achieving deterrent effects, especially for economic offenses that are theoretically more responsive to deterrence due to offenders' rational capacity to assess costs and benefits.

The urgency of effective sentencing reform in Eastern Europe is particularly acute in the context of economic crimes. According to Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index many post-socialist countries continue to struggle with endemic corruption and economic criminality, with average CPI scores in the region ranging from 35 to 56 (compared to Western European averages of 65-80), indicating persistent challenges in deterring financial misconduct. In Poland, economic crimes accounted for approximately 18% of all reported offenses in 2022, while in Romania, the National Anticorruption Directorate (DNA) reported that corruption-related economic damages exceeded €450 million in 2021 alone. These figures underscore the critical need for sentencing systems that can effectively deter economically motivated offending while maintaining proportionality and legitimacy. Moreover, the economic constraints facing these jurisdictions with incarceration costs consuming 2-4% of justice budgets compared to less than 1% in Western Europe make the efficient calibration of sanctions between fines and imprisonment not merely a theoretical concern but a practical necessity.

Despite extensive literature on sentencing philosophies, including applications of the "just deserts" approach. there is a lack of critical analysis evaluating whether sentencing systems grounded in such normative theories actually fulfill their intended purposes when assessed using an economic framework. This study identifies several crucial gaps in the literature that necessitate further scholarly attention. Previous studies have revealed that within the USSG, imprisonment and fines though conceptually interchangeable are not systematically linked through an equivalent formula, indicating a lack of internal coherence in sanction design. Similar inconsistencies have been observed in the Netherlands and Indonesia suggesting that this issue transcends jurisdictional boundaries. Existing research has not yet evaluated whether sentencing provisions effectively ensure that criminal sanctions outweigh the potential benefits of offending, as articulated in foundational deterrence theory by Bentham (1823, 2017), Becker (1974), and Posner (1986).

Comparative legal scholarship has explored a range of sentencing systems yet limited research addresses the specific needs of post-socialist Eastern European jurisdictions. These countries face a constellation of unique challenges: economic crimes substantially damage public trust and undermine emerging market institutions; sentencing reforms must simultaneously address goals of retribution, rehabilitation, and deterrence while maintaining conformity with EU legal standards; budgetary constraints render incarceration particularly burdensome relative to GDP; and legal drafters seek evidence-based models that avoid reproducing flaws embedded in existing Western frameworks. Although Economic Analysis of Law (EAL) has proven instrumental in evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of legal rules in other areas , it remains significantly underutilized in the field of criminal sentencing, especially in comparative contexts. This lack of integration represents a missed opportunity to apply analytical tools that can clarify whether sentencing provisions are structured to create meaningful deterrent incentives.

A further deficiency in current sentencing frameworks particularly within the USSG is the absence of explicit formulations linking the severity of harm to specific sanctions. While the "just deserts" theory supports the idea of proportional punishment, it does not offer a concrete method for translating harm into quantifiable sanction metrics. Although some scholars have developed linear models to measure offense seriousness most notably Wolfgang et al.'s National Survey of Crime Severity (1985) and subsequent refinements —these psychometric approaches remain largely divorced from common social intuitions and have not been systematically integrated into sentencing guidelines as operational conversion formulas. There is no comprehensive research to date assessing whether sentencing guidelines such as the USSG contain explicit, rational conversion schemes that connect monetary harm to imprisonment duration, imprisonment to equivalent fine amounts, or overall sanction severity to the offender's legitimate earning potential.

This research therefore aims to evaluate the deterrent effectiveness of the USSG in addressing economic crimes through the methodological lens of Economic Analysis of Law, and to generate comparative insights relevant for Eastern European legal reform. The analysis focuses specifically on offenses governed by §2B1.1 of the USSG, including larceny, embezzlement, and theft. This study examines whether the maximum financial penalties prescribed within each loss category exceed the maximum potential damages, thereby neutralizing any economic incentive to offend despite being fined. The analysis further explores whether the economic value of imprisonment measured by foregone earning potential corresponds proportionally to the monetary harm caused, in line with the normative expectation of proportionality embedded in "just deserts" theory. Lastly, the study investigates whether the monthly economic value of imprisonment is lower than the income one could earn through lawful employment at the minimum wage level, ensuring that legal work remains more economically attractive than crime followed by incarceration.

The findings of this study are intended to contribute meaningfully to post-socialist sentencing reform. Theoretically, the study demonstrates how Economic Analysis of Law can complement and operationalize the principles of just deserts by providing concrete, measurable frameworks for evaluating deterrent effectiveness and proportionality. Methodologically, it offers a replicable analytical model that can be applied across jurisdictions to assess the internal rationality of sentencing systems. On a comparative level, the research provides a critical assessment of the USSG as a prominent Western model, offering cautionary lessons for reforming jurisdictions to avoid adopting structurally flawed sentencing schemes. Practically, the study offers implementable recommendations for incorporating economic logic into criminal code drafting, including the formulation of equivalency ratios between fines and imprisonment, and the alignment of sanction severity with offender profitability and earning capacity. By emphasizing that sentencing systems must be intelligible and economically rational to ordinary citizens, the study also contributes to broader access-to-justice discourse, where substantive fairness is as vital as procedural integrity.

This research is delimited to an analysis of the United States Sentencing Guidelines as the principal model, with relevance directed toward Eastern European jurisdictions undergoing post-socialist legal transitions. The study focuses on economic crimes specifically larceny, embezzlement, and theft as these involve quantifiable monetary losses, making them suitable for economic analysis. The sanctions evaluated are limited to imprisonment and fines, intentionally excluding mechanisms such as forfeiture, restitution, probation, or hybrid criminal-civil remedies to maintain analytical clarity and conceptual consistency. The theoretical foundation is grounded in Economic Analysis of Law, supplemented by just deserts theory, Bentham's utilitarian framework, and the Double Track System model. The temporal scope of analysis is based on the most recent USSG (2024 edition), with relevant economic data from the 2018–2024 period. This study does not undertake empirical analysis of sentencing outcomes or plea bargaining practices, nor does it explore all offense categories under the USSG or analyze jurisdictional sentencing disparities across U.S. federal courts. Furthermore, it does not provide detailed comparative case studies of individual Eastern European criminal codes, but rather proposes general principles and recommendations to support evidence-based reform

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a normative legal research methodology, combining both statutory and conceptual approaches. The normative method focuses on identifying and evaluating the coherence, rationality, and effectiveness of legal norms as they are codified in formal legal instruments. In this context, the research aims to uncover normative truths embedded within the United States Sentencing Guidelines (USSG) through structured legal reasoning and theoretical analysis. The statutory approach is used to examine the content and structure of USSG provisions, while the conceptual approach enables the integration of theoretical models from legal philosophy, deterrence theory, and sentencing jurisprudence.

In addition to normative legal interpretation, this research incorporates Economic Analysis of Law (EAL) as an evaluative framework, following the work of Posner, Becker, and further refined through the lens of microeconomic legal analysis as developed by Atmasasmita and Wibowo. The inclusion of EAL in this study serves to assess the internal rationality of sentencing provisions by determining whether they are designed in such a way that the cost of punishment outweighs the potential benefits of committing a crime. Economic analysis is especially relevant to the study of economic crimes, which are typically premeditated and calculated by offenders who are assumed to act under rational cost-benefit considerations. The EAL framework enables the examination of whether the legal rule achieves social efficiency where penalties are structured to minimize overall harm and maximize social welfare.

The specific sentencing provision analyzed in this study is §2B1.1 of the USSG, which governs offenses such as larceny, embezzlement, and other forms of property theft. This section is selected because it provides a measurable framework for examining the relationship between monetary harm (i.e., financial loss suffered by victims) and the corresponding criminal sanctions (i.e., imprisonment and fines). The methodological analysis proceeds by combining the maximum loss value for each offense category with the maximum fines permitted for the corresponding offense level. This combination exposes significant disparities, particularly in cases where the maximum fine allowed is substantially lower than the potential financial gain from committing the offense. To highlight these irrationalities, categories where the maximum fine is lower than the upper limit of financial loss are flagged in bold, signaling that the punishment may be insufficient to disincentivize the offense thus violating the foundational deterrence maxim that "crime must not pay".

To address the second research question whether imprisonment is economically proportionate to the financial harm caused the study calculates an economic value per unit of incarceration by dividing the upper loss threshold for each offense category by the maximum number of imprisonment months provided for that level. These results are then compared to the regional minimum wage benchmark in the United States during the period 2018–2024, representing the economic value that could be lawfully earned by individuals working under disadvantaged conditions. When the calculated value per month of imprisonment significantly exceeds the legal minimum wage, it indicates that the imprisonment cost (i.e., the sanction) is lower than the benefit the perpetrator would receive from the crime. This creates an economically irrational incentive: incarceration becomes a more efficient way of “repaying” crime than working legally, thus contradicting the expected function of penal sanctions.

This analytical model underscores a critical flaw in the sentencing framework, whereby high-value economic crimes are insufficiently penalized either through fines or imprisonment. The findings suggest that the USSG’s sentencing structure lacks an internal conversion formula that equitably translates financial harm into proportional punishment. From an economic perspective, such a failure introduces structural inefficiency and threatens the broader goals of fairness, retributive justice, and crime prevention. The analysis further shows that offenders may rationally prefer committing crimes followed by brief incarceration rather than enduring longer periods of lawful employment with lower cumulative earnings. Such outcomes undermine both the legitimacy and the deterrent effect of the criminal justice system.

This methodology anchored in the normative interpretation of codified rules and supplemented by quantitative economic analysis allows the study to make two key contributions. First, it reveals the internal inconsistencies and irrationalities within a highly developed Western sentencing model. Second, it generates insights that are applicable to transitional legal systems in Eastern Europe, where policy borrowing is frequent and sentencing reforms are ongoing. While this study does not undertake empirical research or in-depth analysis of Eastern European criminal codes, the methodology offers a replicable framework for evaluating whether proposed sentencing structures meet basic thresholds of rationality, proportionality, and deterrence. In so doing, it informs the broader discourse on access to justice by emphasizing that sentencing systems must be intelligible, equitable, and economically rational to preserve public trust and institutional legitimacy.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Assessing Whether Ussg Sanctions Deter Economic Crime

The first research question evaluates whether the United States Sentencing Guidelines (USSG), particularly under §2B1.1, are effective in deterring economic crime. Deterrence theory, as articulated by classical utilitarians such as Jeremy Bentham and developed in modern economics by Gary Becker, holds that rational individuals will refrain from criminal conduct when the expected cost of punishment exceeds the expected benefit of the offense. Therefore, for structured sentencing systems like the USSG to deter crime particularly economically motivated offenses such as larceny, embezzlement, and theft they must impose sanctions that outweigh the potential economic gains from such crimes.

To examine whether this logic is upheld in practice, this study introduces an empirical calculation of what it terms the "economic value per month of imprisonment". This is computed by dividing the maximum potential loss within each offense category by the maximum term of imprisonment allowed for that offense level under the USSG sentencing table (§5A). The resulting figure reflects the monetary value of harm associated with each month of incarceration providing an estimate of the economic gain that offenders might retain for each month they are imprisoned, assuming no restitution is imposed. For comparison, the analysis introduces the U.S. minimum wage (ranging between $1,160 and $1,960 per month) as a benchmark for the lawful income an individual would earn through legitimate labor under disadvantaged conditions.

As illustrated in the accompanying USSG §2B1.1 Economic Crime Sentencing Table, the data indicate a systemic failure of proportionality between harm and punishment at higher levels of economic crime. For instance, in Category C, involving up to $40,000 in loss, the offender faces 24 months of imprisonment and a maximum fine of $30,000. This results in a loss-per-month ratio of $1,666, which already exceeds the minimum monthly wage. This means that, from a rational-choice perspective, incarceration does not offset the benefit gained from the crime. The disparity becomes more extreme in higher categories.

For example, in Category H, where the upper loss threshold is $1,500,000, and the maximum imprisonment is 70 months, the ratio reaches $21,428 per month. In Category J, where the loss reaches $25 million, the offender may serve 135 months in prison, resulting in a monthly loss value of $185,185. This far exceeds any rational punitive value when compared with legal income. It implies that an offender might rationally accept incarceration as a cost of doing business—effectively monetizing their prison sentence. In such scenarios, crime remains profitable, which runs counter to both utilitarian deterrence theory and public expectations of justice.

It is important to note that these calculations are based on the maximum penalties prescribed by the USSG. However, empirical data reveal that actual sentences frequently fall below guideline maximums. According to the United States Sentencing Commission (2023), only 48.6% of federal economic crime cases in fiscal year 2022 resulted in sentences within the applicable guideline range, while 43.2% received downward departures due to substantial assistance, acceptance of responsibility, or other mitigating factors. Moreover, the average sentence imposed for fraud offenses was 27 months—substantially lower than the guideline maximum for equivalent loss categories. This sentencing discount further exacerbates the deterrence deficit identified in our analysis, as offenders may rationally anticipate receiving sanctions well below the theoretical maximum, thereby reducing the expected cost of criminal conduct even beyond the structural inadequacies demonstrated in Table 1.

The prevalence of plea bargaining in the U.S. federal system compounds this problem. Approximately 90% of federal criminal cases are resolved through guilty pleas rather than trial, often involving charge bargaining that reduces both the offense level and the applicable sentencing range. In economic crime prosecutions specifically, prosecutors may accept pleas to lesser offenses in exchange for cooperation or to expedite case resolution, resulting in sanctions substantially below those contemplated in the USSG framework for the actual harm caused. For instance, an embezzlement involving $1.5 million (Category H, with a guideline maximum of 70 months) may be pled down to a lesser category through charge manipulation, resulting in actual incarceration of 18-24 months or even probation with restitution. While plea bargaining serves legitimate efficiency objectives within an overburdened criminal justice system, it further undermines the already inadequate deterrent structure of the USSG by creating predictable discounts that rational offenders incorporate into their cost-benefit calculations.

This is further reinforced by the fine-to-loss ratio. Across multiple categories, maximum fines are disproportionately capped and do not scale proportionally with loss values. For example, a $1.5 million loss may be penalized with a fine of only $200,000, which constitutes a mere 13% of the total harm. In Category J ($25 million loss), the maximum fine of $350,000 accounts for only 1.4% of the damage caused. These inconsistencies show that even when imprisonment is combined with fines, the total sanction does not meaningfully offset the expected profit from crime.

Such a regime contradicts Bentham's foundational rule of punishment that:

"The mischief of the punishment must exceed the advantage of the offense" (Bentham, An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, 2017, [originally 1780]).

Likewise, Becker's model (1974) of expected utility of criminal behavior suggests that rational offenders will weigh the severity and probability of sanctions against the potential gains. If the utility of crime remains positive due to light fines and limited incarceration then criminal behavior persists. This theoretical expectation is confirmed by empirical data: according to USFacts USproperty crime in the United States increased by 6.7% in 2022, marking the first annual increase since 2001, with larceny-theft up by 7.4%. These patterns suggest a declining deterrent effect, particularly for financially motivated offenses.

In light of this analysis, the USSG sentencing framework although designed to ensure consistency and proportionality fails to produce outcomes that deter economic crime effectively. This failure is not incidental, but structural. By design, the guideline's offense level system does not integrate a formula that links monetary harm to imprisonment or fine severity in a rational or scalable way. The economic value of prison time remains disconnected from the value of the crime, and fines appear to serve as symbolic gestures rather than punitive mechanisms.

This misalignment poses a serious challenge to the legitimacy and credibility of criminal sentencing. In a rational legal system, particularly for crimes involving calculated monetary benefits, sanctions must not only be predictable and fair they must also remove the economic incentive to offend. The USSG's failure to neutralize the benefits of economic crime suggests that its sentencing structure may, paradoxically, incentivize criminal behavior by offering low-risk, high-reward outcomes to rational offenders.

Therefore, the answer to the first research question is clear: the USSG, in its current form, does not deter economic crime effectively. It fails to create a credible economic disincentive, particularly for high-value offenses, and contradicts the very principles of deterrence it was designed to uphold. This undermines not only the theoretical soundness of the system but also its practical capacity to reduce financial crime in society.

This systemic failure of deterrence is not merely a problem of inadequate severity; it reflects a deeper structural deficiency in how the USSG conceptualizes the relationship between harm and punishment. The lack of effective deterrence stems from the absence of a coherent economic equivalence between the monetary value of crime and the monetary or temporal cost of sanctions. To understand this deficit more fully, we must examine whether the USSG embodies a rational, proportional conversion mechanism between financial loss and the severity of punishment whether measured in fines or imprisonment. This is the focus of the following section.

Evaluating The Economic Equivalence Between Loss And Sanctions In USSG

The second research question investigates whether the United States Sentencing Guidelines (USSG) embody an economically and normatively proportional relationship between the harm caused by economic crimes and the severity of sanctions imposed, particularly in the form of imprisonment and fines. This is an essential inquiry under both the just deserts theory and the framework of Economic Analysis of Law. as proportionality is a cornerstone of legitimate punishment systems and effective deterrence mechanisms.

In a rational penal system, one would expect that the greater the monetary harm caused by an offense, the greater the sanction measured either in longer incarceration or higher fines. Moreover, if fines and imprisonment are to be considered interchangeable or substitutable sanctions, there should exist a coherent conversion logic between the two. For example, a $1 million harm should either result in (a) a sufficiently long prison term to represent equivalent suffering or deterrence value, or (b) a fine that meets or exceeds the harm caused, ideally both. However, the structure of the USSG reveals that such equivalence is not systematically maintained.

The sentencing table (see Table: USSG §2B1.1 Economic Crime Sentencing Table) presents clear evidence of this disproportionality. Take for example:

Category G: Loss = $550,000; Maximum Fine = $150,000 → Fine-to-Loss Ratio = 0.27.

This implies that even if the offender is fined to the maximum allowable extent, they retain 73% of the illicit gain.

Category J: Loss = $25,000,000; Maximum Fine = $350,000 → Fine-to-Loss Ratio = 0.014.

Here, over 98% of the criminal gain is untouched by the fine.

These figures demonstrate that fines do not scale proportionally with harm. The lack of an upper fine ceiling that adjusts with increasing offense value creates a situation where offenders in high-value categories are subject to weaker proportional penalties than those in low-value categories. This inverse proportionality directly violates the principle of equality before the law and offends the retributive logic central to the just deserts model, where the punishment should match the gravity of the offense (Reid, 2011; Sloan III & Miller, 1990).

Imprisonment fares no better. Although the offense level increases with financial harm, the structure of sentence enhancement is logarithmic and plateaued, rather than linear or directly proportional. For instance:

Category F: Loss = $250,000; Max Imprisonment = 46 months → Loss per month = $5,435

Category H: Loss = $1.5 million; Max Imprisonment = 70 months → Loss per month = $21,428

Category K: Loss = $55 million; Max Imprisonment = 168 months → Loss per month = $327,381

The imprisonment burden per dollar lost decreases significantly as the value of loss increases. In other words, for large-scale economic crimes, the punishment dilutes per unit of harm, which is conceptually perverse. In proportional punishment systems, the cost to the offender should grow at least as fast as, or faster than, the harm to the victim. Yet the USSG structure demonstrates the opposite: the more you steal, the less you suffer per dollar stolen.

From the EAL perspective, this reflects an irrational sentencing architecture. Posner (1986) emphasized that law should replicate market efficiency, and punishments must be set at levels that not only internalize the externalities caused by the crime but also dissuade repetition. A penalty system that fails to reclaim the loss, either through fines or imprisonment equivalents, incentivizes repeat offending particularly among actors who have the resources to absorb non-proportional sanctions.

Furthermore, the absence of a formal conversion scheme between fine and imprisonment (e.g., 1 month prison = $X of fine) reflects an underdeveloped sentencing logic. Without such a standard, judges, policymakers, and offenders themselves lack a clear, predictable understanding of how monetary loss is translated into deprivation of liberty or financial penalty. This vagueness violates the requirement of legal certainty (lex certa), which is central to the rule of law and access to justice.

This structural disjunction is further confirmed when juxtaposing sanctions against U.S. minimum wage benchmarks. For instance, when the economic value per month of imprisonment for a $25 million offense is over $185,000 (Category J), but a lawful worker earns under $2,000 per month, the implication is troubling. From a rational economic standpoint, it becomes more attractive to commit high-value crimes and serve time, than to work honestly. This not only defeats the deterrent aim of criminal law but also undermines the moral message that punishment must send to society.

In summary, the answer to the second research question is negative. There is no consistent, rational, or proportional relationship between the magnitude of monetary harm and the severity of punishment under the USSG. The lack of economic equivalency between loss and sanctions, and the absence of a fine-to-imprisonment conversion mechanism, render the current sentencing framework flawed both economically and normatively. This calls for a comprehensive reform agenda that aligns criminal sanctions with quantifiable social harm and reflects real-world cost-benefit logic that governs offender decision-making.

As shown in Table 1, the offender in category P may retain over $500 million in gain while facing only 262 months of incarceration, resulting in a loss-per-month ratio exceeding $2 million.

Table 1. Sentencing Structure for Economic Crimes under USSG §2B1.1: Comparative Analysis of Loss Amount, Imprisonment, and Fine Provisions

Base Value: 6		Article No.	§2B1.1.(a).(1).						
Loss (Apply the Greatest)			**In-crease in Level**	**Upper Limit Loss**	**Current Offense Level**	**Max Prison (Months)**	**Maximum Fines**	**Upper Limit Loss / Max Prison**
(A)	Equal or less	$ 6,500	0	$ 6,500	6	18	$ 9,500	$ 361
(B)	More than	$ 6,500	2	$ 15,000	8	24	$ 20,000	$ 625
(C)	More than	$ 15,000	4	$ 40,000	10	30	$ 40,000	**$ 1,333**
(D)	More than	$ 40,000	6	$ 95,000	12	37	**$ 55,000**	**$ 2,568**
(E)	More than	$ 95,000	8	$ 150,000	14	46	**$ 75,000**	**$ 3,261**
(F)	More than	$ 150,000	10	$ 250,000	16	57	**$ 95,000**	**$ 4,386**
(G)	More than	$ 250,000	12	$ 550,000	18	71	**$ 100,000**	**$ 7,746**
(H)	More than	$ 550,000	14	$ 1,500,000	20	87	**$ 150,000**	**$ 17,241**
(I)	More than	$ 1,500,000	16	$ 3,500,000	22	105	**$ 150,000**	**$ 33,333**
(J)	More than	$ 3,500,000	18	$ 9,500,000	24	125	**$ 200,000**	**$ 76,000**
(K)	More than	$ 9,500,000	20	$ 25,500,000	26	150	**$ 250,000**	**$ 170,000**
(L)	More than	$ 25,500,000	22	$ 65,000,000	28	175	**$ 250,000**	**$ 371,429**
(M)	More than	$ 65,000,000	24	$ 150,000,000	30	210	**$ 300,000**	**$ 714,286**
(N)	More than	$ 150,000,000	26	$ 250,000,000	32	262	**$ 350,000**	**$ 954,198**
(O)	More than	$ 250,000,000	28	$ 550,000,000	34	327	**$ 350,000**	**$ 1,681,957**
(P)	More than	$ 550,000,000	30	##############	36	405	**$ 400,000**	**$ 26,049,383**

The table illustrates the progression of offense levels under §2B1.1 for economic crimes, alongside corresponding maximum imprisonment, fines, and the ratio between loss and sentence length, highlighting potential economic irrationality and disproportionality in the sentencing framework.

Table 2. Comparative Sentencing Structures for Economic Crimes in Selected Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction	**Loss Amount (USD)**	**Max. Imprisonment**	**Max. Fine**	**Fine/Loss Ratio**	**Conversion Formula**
United States (USSG §2B1.1)	$1,500,000	70 months	$200,000	0.13	None—discretionary
Netherlands (Art. 321 DPC)	€1,300,000 (~$1,400,000)	72 months	€87,000 (~$94,000)	0.07	1 day = €500 (day-fine system)
Indonesia (Art. 362 KUHP)	Rp 21B (~$1,400,000)	60 months	Rp 100M (~$6,700)	0.005	None—fixed maximum
Germany (§263 StGB)	€1,400,000	60 months	Variable (up to 720 day-fines × income)	0.40-0.80*	Day-fine = daily net income

Source: United States Sentencing Commission, 2024 Guidelines Manual, §2B1.1; Quick Facts on 2B1.1 Offenders; German day-fine literature (e.g., German Experience With the System of Day Fines.

As illustrated in Table 2, the structural inadequacies of the USSG are not unique but reflect a broader pattern in contemporary sentencing systems. The Netherlands, despite employing a day-fine system that theoretically links sanctions to offender income, similarly caps fines at levels far below the potential criminal gain. Indonesia exhibits even more severe disproportionality, with maximum fines constituting less than 0.5% of high-value losses. Germany's day-fine system represents a partial solution by scaling fines to offender income rather than offense value; however, even this approach fails to ensure that total sanctions exceed illicit gains in high-value cases. This comparative analysis underscores that the deterrence deficit identified in the USSG is symptomatic of a global failure to integrate economic rationality into sentencing design a deficiency that Eastern European reformers must consciously avoid rather than replicate.

Implications For Sentencing Reform in Eastern European Jurisdictions

Having established both the deterrence deficit in Section 3.1 where the USSG fails to impose sanctions that exceed the benefits of crime and the proportionality gap in Section 3.2 where no rational equivalence exists between monetary harm and punishment severity we now turn to the implications of these findings for Eastern European jurisdictions undergoing post-socialist legal transformation. The structural failures identified in the USSG are not merely technical deficiencies in a foreign legal system; they represent cautionary lessons for reforming jurisdictions that risk importing similar flaws when adopting Western sentencing models without critical adaptation.

The findings of this study have significant implications for sentencing reform in Eastern European legal systems, particularly in post-socialist jurisdictions that have undergone systemic transformation since the collapse of the Soviet bloc. Poland provides an instructive example: its 1997 Criminal Code, drafted during the transition to democracy, incorporated sentencing provisions that critics argue maintain a disconnect between the severity of economic offenses and corresponding sanctions. Similarly, Romania's experience with anti-corruption reform has revealed that even with institutional innovations such as the National Anticorruption Directorate (DNA), effective prosecution requires sentencing frameworks that credibly deter high-value economic crimes a challenge that remains partially unmet despite multiple legislative amendments between 2006 and 2018. Ukraine's post-Euromaidan criminal justice reforms, initiated in 2014 and continuing through 2022, have explicitly sought to harmonize sentencing provisions with European standards while addressing endemic corruption; however, legal scholars note that the absence of economically calibrated sentencing formulas continues to undermine deterrence objectives.

These countries including Lithuania, Bulgaria, and the Czech Republic have embarked on extensive legal modernization processes, often adopting or adapting Western legal models as part of European Union approximation, constitutional reform, and criminal justice realignment , as this study demonstrates, adopting Western sentencing frameworks without critical evaluation may inadvertently reproduce structural inefficiencies and normative contradictions that undermine deterrence and access to justice. The risk is particularly acute given that many Eastern European reformers have looked to the United States federal system, including the USSG, as a model of "modern" structured sentencing without recognizing its inherent economic irrationalities.

The imperative for economically rational sentencing is underscored by the persistent burden of economic crimes in post-socialist jurisdictions. Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index reveals that Eastern European countries continue to lag behind Western Europe in controlling corruption and economic misconduct, with regional averages indicating moderate to high vulnerability. In Poland, economic offenses including embezzlement, fraud, and corruption accounted for 18% of all criminal proceedings in 2022, reflecting both improved detection capacity and ongoing prevalence. Romania's DNA reported investigating corruption cases involving cumulative damages exceeding €450 million in 2021 alone, with the majority involving public officials and high-value procurement fraud. In Ukraine, economic courts play a critical role in adjudicating commercial disputes and economic crimes. The Supreme Court's 2021 analysis indicates that despite ongoing anti-corruption reforms, economic courts continue to handle substantial caseloads involving property claims and business-related offenses.

These figures illustrate that economic crimes are not peripheral concerns but central challenges to the rule of law and economic development in the region. When sentencing systems fail to deter such offenses—either because sanctions are disproportionately lenient or because the economic logic of punishment is incoherent public trust in legal institutions erodes, and criminal behavior persists. This is particularly dangerous in societies where institutional legitimacy remains fragile following decades of authoritarian rule and where economic inequality fuels perceptions of elite impunity.

One of the key lessons from the US Sentencing Guidelines (USSG) is the danger of relying on formalistic sentencing grids without ensuring substantive rationality. The USSG, despite its structured appearance, fails to establish a proportionate and economically rational link between harm and punishment. As shown in the previous sections, the guideline allows for disproportionately lenient outcomes for high-value economic crimes, where offenders retain significant illicit gains even after paying fines or serving prison time. This problem becomes even more acute in transitional societies where legal institutions often suffer from limited legitimacy, low public trust, and constrained enforcement capacity.

In such contexts, sentencing must serve not only a retributive or incapacitative function, but also a symbolic and communicative one. The penal system must convey a clear normative message: that crime, especially economic crime, does not pay. When punishment is not economically or morally proportionate to the harm caused, the public perceives the law as arbitrary or corrupt—fueling further legal cynicism, and potentially, social instability. This is particularly dangerous in countries with histories of bureaucratic impunity, elite privilege, and economic disparity.

Moreover, many Eastern European states face significant fiscal and infrastructural limitations that constrain sentencing options. Prison expenditure, while representing a smaller share of GDP compared to wealthy Western European states (0.11-0.23% vs higher percentages in Nordic countries), nonetheless constitutes a disproportionate burden relative to overall government capacity and per capita GDP. Daily incarceration costs in Bulgaria (EUR 6.50), Romania (EUR 10), and Moldova (EUR 10.60) are dramatically lower than in Western Europe, where Norway (EUR 330) and Sweden (EUR 303) invest heavily in rehabilitation infrastructure. This resource disparity combined with prison overcrowding rates exceeding 120% in several Eastern European jurisdictions makes the overuse of imprisonment both economically inefficient and politically unsustainable, particularly in the absence of well-developed alternative sanctions.

The Economic Analysis of Law (EAL) offers a valuable alternative framework for these jurisdictions. Rather than borrowing sentencing matrices wholesale, Eastern European lawmakers can adopt an economic benchmarking approach. For instance:

- Define the monetary value of one month of imprisonment, using national minimum wage or GDP per capita as a baseline.
- Design fine structures that scale automatically with the quantified harm.
- Implement conversion formulas that allow judges to substitute between imprisonment and fine based on measurable deterrent value.
- Integrate sentencing data with economic forecasts, to ensure penal sanctions are sustainable, rational, and effective across economic cycles.

By introducing such reforms, post-socialist legal systems can build sentencing frameworks that are coherent, transparent, and empirically grounded, thus enhancing their compliance with the rule of law and democratic legitimacy. Furthermore, these reforms would align with EU expectations for proportionality, legal certainty, and effective enforcement, which are foundational to accession protocols and constitutional convergence.

It is also crucial for Eastern European jurisdictions to invest in public communication and transparency in sentencing policy. Legal reform does not only involve the adoption of new rules but also the transformation of public expectations and legal consciousness. When citizens see that high-level offenders, particularly in financial crimes, are punished in ways that reflect the gravity of their actions, they are more likely to internalize legal norms and engage with the justice system as a legitimate institution.

In summary, this study provides a cautionary insight: the USSG, while often admired for its formal structure and predictability, may contain inherent weaknesses that are inappropriate for replication in other jurisdictions without significant adaptation. Post-socialist states in Eastern Europe, seeking to build resilient, credible, and just penal systems, should avoid copying sentencing models that separate the concept of harm from the logic of punishment. Instead, they should develop models that are responsive to local economic realities, aligned with deterrence theory, and embedded in a social contract that values fairness, transparency, and proportionality.

Limitations and Alternative Perspectives

While this study demonstrates the utility of Economic Analysis of Law in evaluating sentencing systems, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of this approach and to recognize alternative perspectives on the purposes of criminal punishment. EAL prioritizes efficiency, rationality, and measurable deterrence frameworks that are particularly well-suited to economically motivated offenses where offenders engage in cost-benefit calculations. However, punishment serves multiple functions beyond deterrence, including moral condemnation, social solidarity, and the expressive communication of collective values.

Critics of purely economic approaches to sentencing argue that reducing punishment to a calculus of costs and benefits may undervalue the intrinsic wrongness of criminal conduct and the symbolic importance of punishment in reaffirming social norms. Moreover, imprisonment carries non-monetary costsincluding stigma, loss of social capital, and psychological suffering that are not fully captured in wage-equivalence calculations. These dimensions of punishment may provide additional deterrent effects or retributive satisfaction that our economic model does not quantify.

Nevertheless, the focus on economic crimes in this study remains methodologically justified. Offenses such as larceny, embezzlement, and fraud are paradigmatically rational crimes, committed by actors who weigh expected gains against expected sanctions. For these offenses, economic rationality is not merely an analytical tool but a reflection of offender decision-making processes. Furthermore, even if punishment serves expressive or communicative functions, these functions are undermined when sanctions are manifestly disproportionate or ineffective. A sentencing system that allows offenders to profit from crime, even after punishment, fails not only economically but also symbolically it communicates that the legal order is either indifferent or incapable of enforcing its own norms.

An additional limitation of this study is its exclusion of restitution mechanisms from the analysis. In U.S. federal practice, courts may order defendants to pay restitution to victims under the Mandatory Victims Restitution Act (18 U.S.C. §3663A), which theoretically addresses the gap between fines and actual losses. However, restitution orders are notoriously difficult to enforce: according to the Government Accountability Office, of the $110 billion in criminal restitution outstanding as of fiscal year 2016, $100 billion (91%) was deemed uncollectible due to offenders' inability to pay, with DOJ collecting only $2.95 billion over the three-year period from fiscal years 2014 through 2016. Furthermore, restitution operates as a civil remedy rather than a criminal sanction, and its sporadic enforcement does not alter the deterrence calculus analyzed in this study. While a comprehensive sentencing framework should integrate restitution with fines and imprisonment, the systemic non-enforcement of restitution orders in practice reinforces rather than mitigates the deterrence deficit we identify. Thus, while we acknowledge that EAL does not exhaust the normative considerations relevant to sentencing, we maintain that it provides an essential and currently underutilized lens for evaluating whether criminal sanctions are structured in ways that can plausibly achieve their stated objectives. For jurisdictions designing or reforming sentencing systems, particularly in contexts where economic crimes pose significant threats to public welfare and institutional legitimacy, the integration of economic logic into sentencing design is not a luxury but a necessity.

CONCLUSION

This study evaluated the effectiveness of the United States Sentencing Guidelines (USSG §2B1.1) in deterring economic crimes through a normative legal framework combined with Economic Analysis of Law (EAL). The findings reveal three key structural deficiencies: sanctions often fail to outweigh the benefits of offending, economic equivalence between harm and punishment is lacking, and there is no rational formula to align financial loss with corresponding penalties. In high-value offenses, punishments remain disproportionately lenient, enabling offenders to retain significant illicit gains even after serving maximum sentences. Consequently, the USSG should serve not as a model but as a cautionary example for Eastern European countries undergoing post-socialist legal reform, such as Poland, Romania, and Ukraine.

Evidence-based reforms are recommended, including: (1) establishing economic conversion formulas to equate imprisonment duration with monetary values based on minimum wage or GDP per capita; (2) implementing proportionally scaled fines that exceed illicit gains to ensure negative expected utility; (3) adopting income-adjusted day-fine systems to maintain proportionality and fairness; (4) capping imprisonment only when economically justified; and (5) creating institutional mechanisms to monitor whether actual sentencing outcomes preserve deterrent efficacy.

This research contributes both theoretically and methodologically by demonstrating how EAL can complement normative theories like just deserts, offering a measurable framework to assess the internal logic and deterrent capacity of sentencing systems. For comparative law scholars, it underscores the risks of uncritical policy transfer. For legislators and practitioners, it presents a replicable analytical model to evaluate sentencing coherence across jurisdictions. Ultimately, a fair and effective penal system must impose sanctions that are transparent, proportionate, and economically rational sufficient to deter calculated offenders while upholding legitimacy in contexts where rule of law remains fragile. The failure of the USSG to fulfill these standards underscores the necessity for sentencing reform grounded in evidence, economic logic, and a principled commitment to making crime unprofitable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND DECLARATIONS

The authors declare that they received no financial support from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency for the research, authorship, or publication of this article. The authors further declare that they have no conflicts of interest that could have influenced the research, analysis, or conclusions presented in this study.

This article was prepared with the assistance of AI tools. Specifically, ChatGPT (OpenAI) was used for language refinement during the drafting process (version reviewed: March 2025). The authors confirm that all

content, arguments, and conclusions were generated independently and remain their sole responsibility. No AI tool was used for generating original research findings or analysis.

REFERENCES

Altobelli E and others, 'Cost Analysis of Penitentiary Systems and Comparison Between the Countries of the Council of Europe' (2024) 12 Economies 311 <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7099/12/11/311>

Atmasasmita R, Analisis Ekonomi Mikro Tentang Hukum Pidana Indonesia (Prenada Media 2017) <https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=en&lr=&id=HKg-DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=Atmasasmita,+R.,+%26+Wibowo,+K.+(2016).+Analisis+Mikro+Ekonomi+Tentang+Hukum+Pidana+Indonesia.+Prenadamedia+Group.&ots=u1q7JMJ3o2&sig=zIrB1KSA13jSaLpZPci96R3o5Kw&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false> accessed 6 October 2025

Atmasasmita R and Wibowo K, Analisis Ekonomi Mikro Tentang Hukum Pidana Indonesia (Prenadamedia Group 2016) <https://perpustakaan.binadarma.ac.id/opac/detail-opac?id=3783> accessed 7 October 2025

Badulescu C, 'Romania: Nations in Transit 2024 Country Report | Freedom House' (2024) <https://freedomhouse.org/country/romania/nations-transit/2024?utm_source=chatgpt.com> accessed 8 October 2025

Bakayanova N and Tsiselskyi O, 'The Role of Economic Courts in The Economic Development of Ukraine' (2022) 8 Baltic Journal of Economic Studies 14 <http://baltijapublishing.lv/index.php/issue/article/view/1797>

Becker GS, Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach, vol 76 (National Bureau of Economic Research : Distributed by Columbia University Press 1974) <https://www.nber.org/books-and-chapters/essays-economics-crime-and-punishment/crime-and-punishment-economic-approach> accessed 6 October 2025

Bentham J, An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation (2017)

Bibas S, 'Plea Bargaining Outside the Shadow of Trial' (2004) 117 Harvard Law Review 2463 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4093404?origin=crossref>

Burkhardt F, 'Institutionalising Authoritarian Presidencies: Polymorphous Power and Russia's Presidential Administration' (2021) 73 Europe-Asia Studies 472 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09668136.2020.1749566>

Conboy MGSS, 'Integrating Law And Economics In Indonesia' (2019) 18 Law Review 1

Farlex, 'The Free Dictionary' (2025) <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/> accessed 7 October 2025

Foucault M, Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison (Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group 1995) <https://books.google.com/books/about/Discipline_and_Punish.html?hl=id&id=AVzuf-r22eoC> accessed 7 October 2025

Frase RS, Theories of Proportionality and Desert (Oxford University Press 2012) <https://academic.oup.com/edited-volume/36315/chapter/318653318>

Gunawan TJ and others, 'Imprisonment and Fine Sentence Inequivalence in Netherland's Criminal Law' (2021) 25 Technium Social Sciences Journal 156 <https://techniumscience.com/index.php/socialsciences/article/view/4994> accessed 7 October 2025

Gunawan TJ and Sholehuddin M, 'Nonequivalence Between Imprisonment and Fines in United States Sentencing Guidelines' (2023) 11 Journal of Law and Sustainable Development e512 <https://ojs.journalsdg.org/jlss/article/view/512>

Hirsch A von, 'The "Desert" Model for Sentencing: Its Influence, Prospects, and Alternatives on JSTOR' (2007) 74 The Johns Hopkins University Press <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40971938> accessed 8 October 2025

Hylton KN, 'Law and Economics versus Economic Analysis of Law' (2019) 48 European Journal of Law and Economics 77 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10657-018-9580-0>

Iancu B, 'The Evolution and Gestalt of the Romanian Constitution', The Max Planck Handbooks in European Public Law (Oxford University PressOxford 2023) <https://academic.oup.com/book/46456/chapter/407755537>

Kirchengast T, 'Proportionality in Sentencing and the Restorative Justice Paradigm : " Just Deserts " for Victims and Defendants Alike ?' (2009) 15 The Berkeley Electronic Press 1 <http://law.bepress.com/unswwps-flrps09/art15>

Krajewski K, 'Sentencing in Poland: Failed Attempts to Reduce Punitiveness' (2016) 45 Crime and Justice 175 <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/685539>

Kruze E and Priede J, 'Cost-Effectiveness of Prison System Development - Comparison of the European Countries' (2020) 1 European Integration Studies 69 <https://eis.ktu.lt/index.php/EIS/article/view/26384>

Mungiu-Pippidi A, 'Civil Society and Control of Corruption: Assessing Governance of Romanian Public Universities' (2011) 31 International Journal of Educational Development 532

<https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0738059310000386>

Office of Justice Programs, 'German Experience With the System of Day Fines' (April 1980) 17 <https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/german-experience-system-day-fines?utm_source=chatgpt.com> accessed 8 October 2025

Ostaszewski P and others, 'Punitiveness of Society and Criminal Policy in Six Central European Countries' (2024) 21 European Journal of Criminology 929 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/14773708241260153>

Penal Reform International, 'Global Prison Trends 2020' (2020) <https://www.penalreform.org/resource/global-prison-trends-2020/> accessed 8 October 2025

Posner R, Economic Analysis of Law (Wolters Kluwer 1986) <https://id.scribd.com/document/361515251/Law-and-Economics-Richard-Posner-Economic-Analysis-of-Law-Wolters-Kluwer-1986> accessed 7 October 2025

Pound R, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Law (Lawbook Exchange 2003) <https://books.google.com/books/about/An_Introduction_to_the_Philosophy_of_Law.html?id=GlNXRLAqZoEC> accessed 7 October 2025

Redlich AD and others, 'The Psychology of Defendant Plea Decision Making.' (2017) 72 American Psychologist 339 <https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/law0000134>

Reid ST, Crime and Criminology (Oxford University Press 2012) <https://www.amazon.com/Crime-Criminology-Sue-Titus-Reid/dp/0199783187> accessed 7 October 2025

Rose-Ackerman S and Palifka BJ, Corruption and Government (Cambridge University Press 2016) <https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/9781139962933/type/book>

Rutkowski CP, 'Fogel's "Justice Model": Stop Trying to Reform. Punish, but Treat All Alike' (1976) <http://www.lib.niu.edu/1976/ii760214.html> accessed 7 October 2025

Saleh G and Gunawan TJ, 'Designing a Just, Definite, Deterrent, Restorative, and Responsive Criminal Justice System through Sentencing Economic Value' (2021) 24 <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/designing-a-just-definite-deterrent-restorative-and-responsive-criminal-justice-system-through-sentencing-economic-value-10428.html> accessed 7 October 2025

Sloan JJ and Miller JL, 'Just Deserts, The Severity Of Punishment And Judicial Sentencing Decisions' (1990) 4 Criminal Justice Policy Review 19 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/088740349000400102>

Statystyczny GU, Judicial Reform in Post-Communist Poland (Yearbook of the Republic of Poland 2022 2022) <https://stat.gov.pl/en/topics/statistical-yearbooks/>

Transparency International, 'Corruption Perceptions Index' (2023) <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2023> accessed 2 September 2025

Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index, 'Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (2023) ' (2024) <https://cedar-heu-project.eu/articles/transparency-international-corruption-perceptions-index-2023> accessed 7 October 2025

United States Government Accountability Office, 'Federal Criminal Restitution: Most Debt Is Outstanding and Oversight of Collections Could Be Improved | U.S. GAO' (2018) <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-18-203> accessed 8 October 2025

United States Sentencing Commission, 'Offender and Offense Characteristics Theft , Property Destruction , and Fraud Offenses 1 Sentences Relative to the Guideline Range Sentence Relative to the Guideline Range' 1

USAFacts, 'What Is the Crime Rate in the US?' (2024) <https://usafacts.org/answers/what-is-the-crime-rate-in-the-us/country/united-states/> accessed 7 October 2025

USSC Data, 'United States Sentencing Commission' (2023) <https://www.ussc.gov/research> accessed 8 October 2025

Walker N, Sentencing in a Rational Society (Penguin Books 1969) <https://books.google.com/books/about/Sentencing_in_a_Rational_Society.html?id=UcPyAAAAMAAJ> accessed 7 October 2025

Warr M, 'What Is The Perceived Seriousness of Crimes?' (1989) 27 Criminology 795 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1989.tb01055.x>

Wolfgang ME and others, 'National Survey of Crime Severity | Bureau of Justice Statistics' (June 1985) <https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/national-survey-crime-severity-0> accessed 8 October 2025.